

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgina 22313-1450 www.upsto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,179	02/16/2001	Veronique Chevalier	202443US0	3089
22850 7:	590 05/07/2003			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER	
	1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		BAHAR, MOJDEH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617 DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003	14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/784,179	CHEVALIER ET AL.
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mojdeh Bahar	1617
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orresp ndence address
THE REPLY FILED 18 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment which a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>[PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		2 mill
		ENI PADMANABHAN IMARY EXAMINER
. Patent and Trademark Office		

PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132 has not been timely submitted, please see MPEP 716.01. Note that no new art was cited in the final office action. Moreover in addition to the rejection under 35 USC 103 in the previous office action, there is an obviousness double patenting rejection in the previous office action that has not been addressed by the applicant..